

TRANSCRIPT OF PROJECT PRESENTATION
AND FORUM FOR PUBLIC COMMENTS
RE: LONG BEACH TERMINAL AREA IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

GRAND HOTEL
4101 E. WILLOW STREET
LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA
NOVEMBER 29, 2005
6:16 P.M.

MARY E. PIERCE, CSR 6143
05-260

1 LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA; TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 2005;
2 6:16 P.M.

3
4 MS. EBERHARD: Well, let's get started.
5 My name is Christine Eberhard. I'm with a firm
6 called Commiquest, and I'm a consultant to Bonterra on
7 this project, and my responsibility is public outreach and
8 facilitating tonight's meeting.

9 I'd like to welcome all of you. There's some
10 familiar faces from past meetings, and we do want to let
11 you know we appreciate you taking your time out of your
12 busy week to attend tonight.

13 This is the first of three meetings for the
14 draft EIR, which is now available for review on the City's
15 web site, and I believe that this is all in handouts in
16 the hall. If you didn't get this, there's several
17 handouts, so be sure you get them.

18 But the City's web site is www.longbeach.gov.
19 It's also on the airport's web site, www.lbg.org, and at
20 each of the Long Beach City libraries, the main library in
21 Lakewood, the main library in Signal Hill and at the City
22 of Long Beach Planning and Building department on the
23 fourth floor.

24 Comments regarding the draft EIR can also be
25 submitted via mail to Angela Reynolds, Environmental

1

3

1 PRESENTERS:
2 Christine Eberhard, Facilitator, CommuniQuest
3 Kathleen Brady, Bonterra Consulting
4 Jessica Feldman, Jones & Stokes
5 Cindy Krebs, Bonterra Consulting
6 Janet Harvey, Meyer, Mohaddes Associates, Inc.
7 Vince Mestre, Mestre Greve Associates
8 John Pehrson, CDM

9
10 PUBLIC COMMENTS (in order of appearance):

11 Birgit Delatorre Daniel Freleaux
12 Luann Bynum Jane Nadeau
13 Michael Bauch Julie Leishman
14 Steven Conley Thomas Brown
15 Susan Rusnak Kimball Fuasick
16 Linda Sopo Roy Hanson
17 Laura Sellmer Jeff Huso
18 Daniel Villani Rachel Bauch
19 Joe Sopo Judith Weldon
20 Jeff Huso

2

1 Officer, City of Long Beach Building Department at
2 333 West Ocean Boulevard, Long Beach, 90802.
3 And as you probably know, you can also submit
4 comments via e-mail, but you cannot -- because of the
5 City's computer system, you can't include any attachments,
6 and that e-mail address is airportEIR@LongBeach.gov.
7 Again, this should all be in your handouts.

8 There's going to be a 45-day public review
9 period for the draft EIR, and so that will be closing on
10 December 22nd, 2005. Comments tonight pertaining to
11 environmental issues received at these meetings will be
12 addressed in writing as part of the final EIR.

13 I want to emphasize that this is not really a
14 discussion on the approval of the EIR. It's about the
15 document that's just been released. And so this meeting
16 is to take comments on your thoughts on the draft EIR.
17 This is your opportunity to comment on the document.

18 This really, as in past meetings with the
19 scoping, it's not a question-and-answer session per se.
20 Any of your comments will be taken whether it's through
21 e-mail or on the written comment forms or speaking
22 tonight. They're all the same, and they have the same
23 weight.

24 We want to capture your input in whatever form
25 you're most comfortable with. Some people prefer talking.

4

<p>1 Some people prefer the comment sheets.</p> <p>2 The handouts regarding the draft EIR findings,</p> <p>3 the project description and the power point presentation</p> <p>4 are the ones that are out front.</p> <p>5 I'd like to now introduce public officials that</p> <p>6 are with us this evening. Jerry Miller, the City Manager,</p> <p>7 has joined us this evening. Director of Public Works</p> <p>8 Christine Andersen is here. Councilmember Patrick</p> <p>9 O'Donnell from the 4th District. Tim Pattons is staff</p> <p>10 representing the 5th District. Rae Gabelich from the 8th</p> <p>11 District is with us. There's Rae. And Councilmember Val</p> <p>12 Lerch from the 9th District is with us.</p> <p>13 Any other City officials or public officials</p> <p>14 that would want to be recognized?</p> <p>15 The timing for tonight's meeting is three</p> <p>16 hours. The format today is going to be first we're going</p> <p>17 to have a presentation by the technical consultants just</p> <p>18 to be sure that you all understand the highlights from the</p> <p>19 draft document. That's going to take 45 minutes to an</p> <p>20 hour.</p> <p>21 Following that, I will come back up here, and</p> <p>22 we'll open the session for the public comments. So we'll</p> <p>23 have plenty of time. There also will be meetings which I</p> <p>24 can identify for you later. There's one Saturday at Long</p> <p>25 Beach City Hall from 9:00 to 1:00, so that's going to be</p> <p style="text-align: right;">5</p>	<p>1 consistent with the requirements for the California</p> <p>2 Environmental Quality Act, or CEQA.</p> <p>3 With me tonight are a number of the experts who</p> <p>4 prepared technical studies on which the findings in the</p> <p>5 EIR were based. To my left here is Jessica Feldman, the</p> <p>6 architectural historian with Jones & Stokes, who prepared</p> <p>7 the cultural analysis, Cindy Krebs from Bonterra</p> <p>8 Consulting, who acted as the project manager and prepared</p> <p>9 the hazardous materials assessment and public services.</p> <p>10 She'll also be talking about aesthetics tonight.</p> <p>11 Vince Mestre with Mestre, Greve & Associates</p> <p>12 conducted the noise analysis. Janet Harvey, with Meyer</p> <p>13 Mohaddes, who prepared the traffic analysis. And John</p> <p>14 Pehrson, with CDM, who was responsible for the air quality</p> <p>15 and human health risk assessment.</p> <p>16 As Chris mentioned, all the slides tonight are</p> <p>17 in one of the handouts that you will receive for the</p> <p>18 meeting today.</p> <p>19 The EIR was prepared with the basic premise</p> <p>20 that the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance would not</p> <p>21 be modified; that the key objective of the project is to</p> <p>22 provide airport facilities to accommodate the minimum</p> <p>23 permitted number of flights at the airport and the</p> <p>24 associated number of passengers served on those flights in</p> <p>25 full compliance with all the fire, building and safety</p> <p style="text-align: right;">7</p>
<p>1 about three hours of public comment. And then also next</p> <p>2 Monday, the 5th, at the Petroleum Club.</p> <p>3 There are restrooms. The men's is not too far</p> <p>4 down the hall. Unfortunately, I found the hard way that</p> <p>5 the women's is closed for, I guess, remodeling. So that</p> <p>6 women go past the lobby all the way to the end into --</p> <p>7 you'll see kind of almost like a ballroom with wood floor,</p> <p>8 and it's right there. Sorry for that inconvenience.</p> <p>9 There is coffee and water in the back, so feel</p> <p>10 free as you need to to get up and move about.</p> <p>11 The meeting is being recorded by a court</p> <p>12 reporter, and she will record all the comments that you</p> <p>13 provide this evening. I will talk later during the</p> <p>14 comment period, but I do ask that if you have side</p> <p>15 conversations or anything to please take it outside,</p> <p>16 partly for the rest of the guests, but also because the</p> <p>17 court reporter may not be able to hear if there's a lot of</p> <p>18 side conversations going on.</p> <p>19 With that, I'd like to introduce Kathleen Brady</p> <p>20 with Bonterra, who is going to make the first presentation</p> <p>21 regarding the project description. Thank you.</p> <p>22 MS. BRADY: Thank you, Chris.</p> <p>23 Thank you for coming tonight. As she said, I'm</p> <p>24 Kathleen Brady. I'm the project manager for Bonterra</p> <p>25 Consulting for the EIR, and the report has been prepared</p> <p style="text-align: right;">6</p>	<p>1 codes, as well as other applicable standards.</p> <p>2 Associated with that objective is the</p> <p>3 commitment to compliance with the existing Airport Noise</p> <p>4 Compatibility Ordinance and maintaining the current</p> <p>5 character of the airport terminal building as a Long Beach</p> <p>6 cultural heritage landmark.</p> <p>7 The proposed improvements would be implemented</p> <p>8 in the area surrounding the existing airport terminal and</p> <p>9 the airport parking area, the aircraft ramp and Parcel O,</p> <p>10 which is located near Clark and Willow.</p> <p>11 The exhibit here shows the locations. Here's</p> <p>12 the terminal building. Here is the ramp area. And I'll</p> <p>13 be talking about it later, that proposed improvements</p> <p>14 would come up into this area, and the hatched marking</p> <p>15 indicates areas that are leasehold to Million Air, for</p> <p>16 bearings. Here's the Gulfstream. Actually, should have</p> <p>17 mentioned it first.</p> <p>18 Here's Lakewood and Donald Douglas Drive, the</p> <p>19 existing parking structure. This is the location of the</p> <p>20 proposed parking structure. And then also, the project</p> <p>21 provides for an extension of Donald Douglas Drive through</p> <p>22 to Lakewood since the current circulation pattern would be</p> <p>23 interfered with by the proposed parking structure.</p> <p>24 As previously indicated, a basic premise of the</p> <p>25 project was maintaining the tenets of the Airport Noise</p> <p style="text-align: right;">8</p>

<p>1 Compatibility Ordinance. The ordinance allows a minimum 2 of 41 commercial carrier flights and 25 commuter flights. 3 The facilities proposed as part of the project have been 4 sized to accommodate the passenger levels associated with 5 the minimum number of flights. 6 The Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance 7 allows the number of flights to increase over the minimum 8 41 commercial flights provided the noise budget outlined 9 in the ordinance is not exceeded. 10 In order for the number of flights to be 11 increased and still comply with the Airport Noise 12 Compatibility Ordinance, the airlines would have to 13 optimize their flight operations through methods such as 14 using quieter aircraft and reducing the number of 15 late-night operations. 16 Under optimal conditions, which have never been 17 achieved at the airport, the estimated number of increased 18 flights would range between seven and eleven flights. 19 Though the proposed project would neither directly nor 20 indirectly allow the increase in the number of flights, at 21 the direction of the City Council, the EIR evaluated the 22 impacts associated with the maximum number of flights that 23 could be expected. 24 In the EIR analysis and what we talk about 25 tonight, this was identified as the optimized flight</p> <p style="text-align: right;">9</p>	<p>1 principles that were used to make sure that the building 2 be consistent with the historic nature of the terminal 3 building. 4 This includes a 1990 Memorandum of 5 Understanding adopted by the Cultural Heritage Commission 6 and City Council pertaining to modifications to the 7 terminal building, and the MOU includes the Secretary of 8 Interior's standards for rehabilitation of historic 9 buildings. 10 There's the development and use standards for 11 the Long Beach Airport Terminal Plan Development 12 Ordinance, which are the zoning regulations, and a 13 memorandum prepared in 2005 for consideration of new 14 construction at the airport. 15 In addition, the City has committed to 16 designing and constructing the new facility to meet high 17 standards for energy efficiency and environmental design. 18 The intention is to construct the facility consistent with 19 LEED standards, which stands for Leadership in Energy and 20 Environmental Design. 21 Now, I'll go through the various improvements, 22 and these are, as I said, outlined in your -- in the 23 summary documents that is one of the handouts. 24 The 13 areas, one is the holdroom areas, which 25 is this region through here. And currently, the airport</p> <p style="text-align: right;">11</p>
<p>1 scenario because in order to achieve this level, the 2 airlines would be required to optimize their operation. 3 So this assumed 52 daily commercial flights and 25 daily 4 commuter flights. 5 The project proposes improvements in 13 areas, 6 which are listed on the slide here, and I'll be discussing 7 each of these in just a moment. 8 The size of the improvements was established by 9 the City Council in February 2005. And while it's 10 premature to develop a final design for the airport 11 improvements, prior to City Council selection of the 12 alternative, a schematic layout showing a proposed 13 footprint of the airport improvements has been developed 14 to provide the basic team parameters, environmental team 15 basic parameters for evaluation of the EIR. 16 During the final design, a precise size and 17 configuration of the proposed improvements may vary to 18 ensure compliance with the applicable fire and building 19 codes and safety and security requirements and operational 20 necessities. However, the overall size of the airport 21 terminal area improvements would not exceed the square 22 footage allocations and would be consistent with the 23 parameters ultimately adopted by the City Council. 24 In developing the concept plan, as well as the 25 ultimate design of the facility, there were basic guiding</p> <p style="text-align: right;">10</p>	<p>1 holdrooms are comprised of both the 1984 permanent 2 holdroom and the temporary modular structures. As part of 3 the proposed project, the 13,150 square feet of temporary 4 holdroom currently being provided through the use of 5 modular buildings would be replaced with 21,171 square 6 feet of permanent floor space. This is a net increase of 7 8,021 square feet. 8 The second area are the concessions, which are 9 shown in this concept plan. They would be expanded to 10 serve the new holdroom areas. Currently, there are 5,460 11 square feet of concessions at the airport, and the 12 proposed project would add an additional 9,541 square 13 feet. 14 The passenger security screening would be done 15 through this area. You know what? And I'm sorry. Let me 16 just back up a moment. 17 Here's the existing terminal building here, and 18 this is Donald Douglas Drive, and you come right up and 19 can drop passengers off and then go through. So the idea 20 would be that it would open up similar to the original 21 configuration of the terminal and then go through the 22 passenger screening areas. 23 Currently there is 3,900 square feet for 24 passenger security screening, and with the proposed 25 project, there would be an additional 7,000 square feet</p> <p style="text-align: right;">12</p>

<p>1 devoted to this use. The passenger security screening --</p> <p>2 excuse me -- baggage screening would be done in this area.</p> <p>3 And currently, the airport does not provide a</p> <p>4 structure for conducting baggage screening, and since</p> <p>5 2003, this has been done under a canopy, and the</p> <p>6 Transportation Security Administration, or TSA, has</p> <p>7 indicated that this open-air situation is not sufficient</p> <p>8 because of the sensitivity of the equipment being used.</p> <p>9 And so the project would provide approximately 7,000</p> <p>10 square feet for security screening of baggage.</p> <p>11 Once the baggage screening is done, it would go</p> <p>12 into a baggage makeup area, which is here. The area shown</p> <p>13 in this yellow color would be -- have a cover to them, but</p> <p>14 they would be open-air. They would not have -- it would</p> <p>15 be an open building similar to how the baggage claim area</p> <p>16 is now. And so from the baggage screening, go to baggage</p> <p>17 makeup and then be loaded onto the aircraft.</p> <p>18 Another area that would be provided is a</p> <p>19 baggage service office, which is here, and a multipurpose</p> <p>20 room right here where this corner here. And currently,</p> <p>21 there are not these facilities at the airport. And the</p> <p>22 project would allow for a 900-square-foot baggage service</p> <p>23 office and a 300-square-foot multipurpose room.</p> <p>24 The area would provide a holding place for</p> <p>25 unclaimed bags, bags that were misdirected or for</p> <p style="text-align: right;">13</p>	<p>1 ticketing, and the combined space for these four functions</p> <p>2 would increase from 6,423 square feet -- would increase</p> <p>3 6,423 square feet for a total of 14,833 square feet.</p> <p>4 The airline gates. It's kind of hard to see on</p> <p>5 here. There's little lines that show the openings for the</p> <p>6 doorways, and currently there are eight aircraft gates for</p> <p>7 boarding and loading and unloading aircraft. And with the</p> <p>8 proposed project, this would increase to eleven gates.</p> <p>9 And as I said, the gates are really used to identify doors</p> <p>10 in the holdroom that are used for passenger boarding.</p> <p>11 In the past, there's been questions about</p> <p>12 jetways. This project would not provide any jetways. It</p> <p>13 would not be possible because jetways require a second</p> <p>14 story access, and the holdroom area is one story and could</p> <p>15 not be retrofitted to accommodate a second story. So</p> <p>16 gates would just be the openings.</p> <p>17 The eleventh area for improvements are the</p> <p>18 aircraft parking positions. There are currently ten</p> <p>19 positions at the airport, and the EIR addressed for up to</p> <p>20 as many as 14 aircraft, and this would result in the</p> <p>21 take-back of property leased to Million Air and used for</p> <p>22 general aviation tie-down and delay parking.</p> <p>23 On the earlier exhibit, that's where I showed</p> <p>24 that it was in the thatched markings. And the general</p> <p>25 aviation aircraft that are displaced from Million Air</p> <p style="text-align: right;">15</p>
<p>1 reporting lost baggage. The multipurpose room would</p> <p>2 provide on-site meeting space for shift briefings,</p> <p>3 training and other meetings for airport and tenant staff</p> <p>4 whose job duties do not allow them to leave the terminal.</p> <p>5 The seventh area would be additional restroom</p> <p>6 space right through here. There would be an increase of</p> <p>7 approximately 2,000 square feet in restrooms in</p> <p>8 non-secured area.</p> <p>9 The eighth area of improvement would be office</p> <p>10 space for security and airport staff and airline support.</p> <p>11 And the TSA currently operates out of the temporary</p> <p>12 modular building. With this project, it would be replaced</p> <p>13 with 5,191 square feet improvement space.</p> <p>14 The airlines would be shown through here, as</p> <p>15 well as some space in the existing terminal. They</p> <p>16 currently have approximately 2,000 square feet within the</p> <p>17 airport terminal, and this would provide the airlines with</p> <p>18 an additional 3,754 feet and that airport staff would</p> <p>19 increase from 6,970 square feet to 11,970 square feet.</p> <p>20 The ticketing facilities would be located right</p> <p>21 in this area here. The expansion of the ticketing areas</p> <p>22 is proposed to accommodate existing demand at the airport,</p> <p>23 and the facilities are broken into four categories, a</p> <p>24 ticketing counter, a space for ticketing counter queuing,</p> <p>25 airlines ticket office, and circulation areas for the</p> <p style="text-align: right;">14</p>	<p>1 would be relocated to a new tie-down area on what's called</p> <p>2 Parcel O, which is south of the runway 12-30 at Clark and</p> <p>3 Willow.</p> <p>4 This area could also potentially be developed</p> <p>5 with aircraft hangars, and this is consistent with the</p> <p>6 March 25th, 2003, Long Beach Airport Development Area's</p> <p>7 map.</p> <p>8 The twelfth area, which does not show on this</p> <p>9 exhibit here, is for vehicular parking. And currently at</p> <p>10 the airport, parking is available both on-site surface</p> <p>11 lots and parking structures, and off-site, parking lot</p> <p>12 leased from Boeing known as lot D.</p> <p>13 There are currently 2,835 permanent parking</p> <p>14 spaces at the airport and approximately 2,100 leased</p> <p>15 spaces. And the leased spaces are done on a</p> <p>16 month-to-month basis.</p> <p>17 And with the project, they're proposing</p> <p>18 construction of a new parking structure which combined</p> <p>19 with the existing parking structure and the surface</p> <p>20 parking would provide a total of 6,286 parking spaces on</p> <p>21 site, and this would eliminate the need for the off-site</p> <p>22 leased parking. The project will provide for 1,351 spaces</p> <p>23 above the existing number of spaces currently available</p> <p>24 for airport use.</p> <p>25 And as I indicated earlier, the structure would</p> <p style="text-align: right;">16</p>

<p>1 require the relocation of the east side of the Donald 2 Douglas Loop.</p> <p>3 Also associated with the parking are proposed 4 modifications to the existing parking structure, which 5 would include a new facade to match the new parking 6 structure and compliment the architecture of the terminal 7 building. And the facades of the terminal building, the 8 parking structures, would provide a unified appearance and 9 would enhance the aesthetics of the airport terminal 10 building.</p> <p>11 The last area is traffic and pedestrian 12 circulation improvements. This would include the 13 extension that I mentioned earlier to the south side of 14 Donald Douglas Loop exiting onto -- it would be a 15 right-out only onto Lakewood Boulevard. And then in 16 addition, a modification of signage, lighting and pavement 17 markings to ensure that they would be safe for pedestrian 18 and vehicular movement.</p> <p>19 As far as how the project would look, as 20 indicated, the City has adopted the guiding principles for 21 any modifications to the airport terminal because the City 22 does value the terminal building and wants to assure its 23 historic integrity.</p> <p>24 To accomplish this, the design ensured the 25 improvements would not look like an add-on to the terminal</p> <p style="text-align: right;">17</p>	<p>1 aircraft parking spaces. However, the City Council 2 determined in February 2005 that no more than 14 aircraft 3 parking spaces to be evaluated in the EIR. So that is one 4 modification from the 2003 NOP.</p> <p>5 The Alternative B further reduces the size of 6 the airport terminal area compared to the proposed 7 project. It would provide a maximum of 79,725 square feet 8 and would also provide similar improvements, though 9 reduced in size. There would be no change in the baggage 10 security screening. There was no additional space assumed 11 for ticketing and no additional airport office space 12 assumed as part of this alternative.</p> <p>13 Alternative C is required by CEQA and is the 14 no-project alternative, and this assumes that no 15 facilities would be provided at the airport and the 16 vehicular parking spaces that are currently leased 17 off-site would not be available because of the short-term 18 nature of the leases. And based on current -- recent 19 discussions with Boeing, they indicated that the leases 20 are not available on a long-term basis.</p> <p>21 And since no vehicular parking spaces would be 22 provided off-site, this alternative would have a net loss 23 of 2100 parking spaces compared to the existing 24 conditions.</p> <p>25 The phasing for the project would be based</p> <p style="text-align: right;">19</p>
<p>1 building or a wall of structures upon approach to the 2 terminal. Modifications to the interior of the building 3 would be in keeping with the original design of the 4 building. I showed you that building right there where 5 people would go out through into the holdroom.</p> <p>6 This is an exhibit that shows the view of the 7 improvements from the airside. Here's the existing 8 terminal building. Here's the walkway, the holdrooms, the 9 office space, the area for the baggage makeup.</p> <p>10 The EIR also addressed three alternatives.</p> <p>11 Alternative A was based on improvements that were outlined 12 in the 2003 Notice of Preparation with minor 13 modifications. Alternative A assumed that the airport 14 terminal will be a maximum of 97,545 square feet, so 15 slightly smaller than what's being evaluated as part of 16 the proposed project.</p> <p>17 And the nature of the improvements would 18 generally be the same as the proposed project. There are 19 minor reductions in square footage in all areas except for 20 the following categories: The baggage security screening 21 would be the same as the proposed project, no additional 22 space was assumed for ticketing facilities, and the amount 23 of the airport office space is increased compared to the 24 proposed project.</p> <p>25 The 2003 Notice of Preparation assumed 16</p> <p style="text-align: right;">18</p>	<p>1 somewhat on availability of funding and service 2 priorities, and the design and improvements would follow 3 the approval of the project by the City Council. And 4 pending funding, it's anticipated that construction 5 improvements would be phased to minimize impacts on the 6 airport operations. And phasing is expected to be the 7 same for all the alternatives. And as you can see, the 8 first action would be construction of areas for Parcel O 9 and then the parking structure and the terminal 10 improvements themselves.</p> <p>11 The EIR did identify significant impacts 12 associated with the project, and we'll be discussing those 13 in more detail shortly, but they were on aesthetics, air 14 quality, cultural resources and hazards with the proposed 15 mediation program, all the construction air quality 16 impacts would be reduced to less than significant.</p> <p>17 Also, as I indicated, the EIR that's not part 18 of the proposed project did address the impacts associated 19 with the optimized flights, and with the optimized flights 20 there were impacts identified with the air quality, land 21 use and transportation and circulation, and after 22 implementation of mitigation measures, only the air 23 quality impact would remain a significant unavoidable 24 impact.</p> <p>25 There are benefits associated with the proposed</p> <p style="text-align: right;">20</p>

<p>1 project. It would provide enhanced TSA and airport 2 security services because of the improved facilities. 3 There would be improved existing and future traffic 4 conditions at the airport because of the enhanced parking 5 on site. There would be a reduction in aircraft emissions 6 by providing the infrastructure necessary to support 7 electric ground support equipment.</p> <p>8 And though not associated with the impact of 9 the project, the EIR recommends the development of a land 10 use compatibility program associated with the optimized 11 flights to benefit homes in the 65 CNEL contour and 12 schools within the 60 CNEL contour. And this would be a 13 voluntary noise attenuation program.</p> <p>14 CEQA does require that an environmentally 15 superior alternative be identified, and the no-project 16 alternative would avoid construction-related impacts. 17 However, it would have more substantial long-term traffic 18 impacts and associated air quality impacts because there 19 would not be sufficient parking, resulting in extra trips 20 associated with meeters and greeters.</p> <p>21 And the project would not provide for the 22 infrastructure, as I mentioned before, for the electric 23 ground support equipment, so there would be increased 24 human health risk concerns. Therefore, the reduction in 25 emissions provided through the mitigation program would</p> <p style="text-align: right;">21</p>	<p>1 project. It does not approve the project itself, that the 2 City Council would need to take a separate action to 3 approve the project.</p> <p>4 Additionally, a certificate of appropriateness 5 from the Cultural Heritage Commission would be required 6 for project design prior to implementation.</p> <p>7 And now I'll turn it to Jessica Feldman.</p> <p>8 MS. FELDMAN: Before I get into discussing the 9 airport terminal building, let me just give you a little 10 brief rundown on why the building design is important.</p> <p>11 As you may know, the airport terminal building 12 was built in 1941 and was declared a Long Beach Cultural 13 Heritage landmark in 1990. The reasons for this are the 14 following: It was the first municipal airport in the 15 Southern California region; it exemplifies the historical 16 and economic heritage of the community; it is considered a 17 masterpiece of an early American modern style of 18 architecture, and it is a unique architectural example in 19 the City of Long Beach.</p> <p>20 The use of the ceramic mosaic tile throughout 21 the building was considered innovative at the time, and 22 the use of representational images reflected the artistic 23 trends of that era.</p> <p>24 It is the quintessential theme building in the 25 airport and is its signature element, and it is the most</p> <p style="text-align: right;">23</p>
<p>1 not apply to the new project.</p> <p>2 Given that there's no substantial difference in 3 the nature of the impacts between the various build 4 alternatives, the EIR determined that the proposed project 5 would be the preferred environmentally superior 6 alternative.</p> <p>7 The project would provide the additional 8 capacity needed to help serve the number of passengers 9 associated with the minimum number of flights. And the 10 HNTB study in 2004 conducted during the scoping process 11 recommended sizes of the facilities to best meet the needs 12 of the passengers, visitors and tenants actually exceeded 13 the square footage allocation even under the proposed 14 project.</p> <p>15 And since the project is able to meet all the 16 project objectives and does not result in substantially 17 greater impacts than the other build alternatives, it was 18 identified as the environmentally superior alternative.</p> <p>19 And with that, I'll turn it over to Jessica 20 Feldman, who will discuss the cultural resources.</p> <p>21 Excuse me. Nope, I am not done.</p> <p>22 It doesn't mean certification of the EIR is 23 approval of the project. Certification of the EIR by the 24 Planning Commission is only a determination that the EIR 25 addresses the impacts associated with the proposed</p> <p style="text-align: right;">22</p>	<p>1 prominent visual feature of the airport, representing an 2 established and familiar visual feature of the 3 neighborhood.</p> <p>4 Some of the character defining features of the 5 terminal include the round windows, the curved walls, and 6 the geometric panels on the rear elevation where the 7 restaurant is, smooth surfaces. The building's also in 8 the shape of an arc. The building maintains almost all 9 its original windows and doors, and ceramic mosaic tiles 10 are located on the first and second floor.</p> <p>11 Now, generally, the building will continue to 12 be used as an airport terminal, which is its original 13 purpose, obviously, and it will retain its overall 14 historic character. And the new construction will be 15 differentiated from the old and compatible in size, 16 massing, scale and style.</p> <p>17 However, components of the proposed 18 improvements would materially destroy or alter some 19 character-defining features that I mentioned earlier, 20 which under CEQA is considered a significant impact.</p> <p>21 These project components, which do not meet the 22 Secretary of the Interior standard for rehabilitation of 23 historic buildings, include damage to historic material 24 and removal or obscuring of original details.</p> <p>25 However, proposed mitigation measures and</p> <p style="text-align: right;">24</p>

<p>1 design changes would reduce the impacts to a level less 2 than significant.</p> <p>3 And now I will turn this over to Cindy, who 4 will discuss the aesthetics, hazards, hazardous waste and 5 public services.</p> <p>6 MS. KREBS: Good evening.</p> <p>7 By the way, "aesthetics" is another word for 8 how things would look or the visual impact of the project.</p> <p>9 The City's zoning ordinance and the May 1990 10 MOU, which Kathleen referenced earlier, both set forth 11 guidelines for improvements to the terminal building. 12 Those guidelines involve building siting. And, as 13 Kathleen has said, there's a desire that there is a space 14 between the buildings to avoid the appearance of a wall of 15 buildings.</p> <p>16 Building heights. The requirement here is that 17 they comply with FAA height restrictions and integrate 18 well with the existing building.</p> <p>19 Parking structures under the guidelines are to 20 provide rooftop landscaping planters and observe the 21 height restrictions. And with regards to overall design, 22 guidelines say that the unique architectural features 23 should be preserved and that the design should be 24 consistent with and in harmony with the existing terminal 25 building.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">25</p>	<p>1 style.</p> <p>2 If you look at how the airport is currently 3 laid out with all the temporary buildings and everything 4 like that, the size isn't really that much larger. The 5 building itself will be larger than the existing buildings 6 and there is an increase, but the way that things are laid 7 out on the project site right now is fairly spread out, 8 and this wouldn't be -- cover much more area than that.</p> <p>9 The scale. The newer buildings will be low 10 elevation, as Kathy mentioned, one story. So the views 11 would still be available from the second story onto the 12 airfield from the restaurant and the deck behind it.</p> <p>13 The style of the new construction would 14 incorporate some of the stylistic elements of the 15 Streamline Moderne architectural style. There would be a 16 curved roof. The west wall of the holdroom would be 17 mostly windows. The arc shape of the terminal building 18 would be copied in the shape of some of the small detached 19 buildings. The roofs of those would mimic that shape.</p> <p>20 And the new roof as it steps from the back of the building 21 forward would have a step elevation, again, something that 22 is characteristic of that architectural style.</p> <p>23 As consistent with CEQA, the EIR concerns 24 itself with hazards and hazardous waste impacts that could 25 result from the implementation of the proposed project.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">27</p>
<p>1 During construction, the proposed project would 2 have some temporary impacts to aesthetics. First of all, 3 there would be temporary alteration of the views at the 4 project site. There are very limited views of the airport 5 off the site. Maybe a few people who live in Signal Hill 6 and look down might be able to see onto the airport bed. 7 Generally, because of the topography in this area is 8 pretty flat, there are very few views away from the 9 airport.</p> <p>10 The types of impacts that are expected during 11 construction include construction equipment would be 12 staged there. Construction materials would also be stored 13 on site. There would be graded surfaces during 14 construction, some truck traffic and some soil stockpiles.</p> <p>15 There could also be some potential light and 16 glare impacts during construction. Those would be 17 associated with the security lighting and light emanating 18 from the proposed improvements. The proposed mitigation 19 program will reduce the impact to a level considered less 20 than significant. The methods that are recommended 21 include low intensity lights, orientation or shielding 22 away from residences and streets and glass that is less 23 than 20 percent reflective.</p> <p>24 The proposed project would be compatible with 25 the existing terminal building in size, massing, scale and</p> <p style="text-align: right;">26</p>	<p>1 Our analysis focused on the terminal areas and parking 2 areas in lot O, not the airport or the airfield as a 3 whole. So when we're talking about hazardous waste 4 analysis, we, in fact, were focused on those.</p> <p>5 We did gather a lot of data though from a wide 6 variety of sources and for areas that extend beyond the 7 proposed project limits. The sources from which the data 8 was gathered included existing historic records and the 9 EIR that's referenced here. The report includes state and 10 federal databases that list past spills, past cleanup 11 efforts, the final disposition of anything that happened 12 on site with regards to those.</p> <p>13 We also looked at fuel storage and fuel 14 dispensing on the airport, the location of underground 15 storage tanks and above-ground storage tanks and whether 16 or not the proposed project would have to interface with 17 any of those locations.</p> <p>18 We looked at the City's -- the airport's 1998 19 asbestos survey and determined that asbestos would be an 20 issue, and there's mitigation recommended for that.</p> <p>21 And then we also used some common sense. 22 Because of the age of the building, we know that there's a 23 heightened potential that there could be lead-based paint 24 within the existing buildings, and because of the 25 airport's location near the 405 freeway and on a fairly</p> <p style="text-align: right;">28</p>

<p>1 heavily traveled road, Lakewood Boulevard, we also assume 2 that air-deposited lead could be found on that Parcel O 3 location. 4 Current hazardous waste practices at the 5 airport are very well defined. We've learned in the past 6 that there have been incidents at the airport, but we've 7 also learned through EIR reports and other investigations 8 that all of those have been addressed appropriately and 9 all the cases have been closed. 10 The airport and the City both share an ongoing 11 commitment to the proper handling of hazardous materials 12 at the airport, and those are documented in the Long Beach 13 Airport Certification Manual and the Long Beach Airport 14 Rules and Regulations. 15 The airport also has a storm water prevention 16 -- pollution prevention plan, that SWPPP that you see 17 there, the City's industrial NPDES permit, which is the 18 National Pollution Discharge Elimination System permit, 19 and a series of best management practices that are used 20 continuously. 21 These programs set forth FAA-approved 22 documented procedures for the handling of hazardous waste 23 on airport property, and those address fuel handling, 24 inspection, fueler training, corrective actions and 25 hazardous materials cleanup procedures. They also comply</p> <p style="text-align: right;">29</p>	<p>1 structure of the baggage security screening that Kathleen 2 mentioned earlier. 3 And again, that's because the type of equipment 4 that they used for that is very sensitive to wind and it 5 does -- activities currently occur in the open air. So 6 the types of improvements that have been proposed would be 7 considered positive from a TSA perspective. 8 The proposed project would provide more secure 9 baggage and passenger screening areas, as I just 10 mentioned. Would also reduce possible safety hazards 11 resulting from overcrowding. 12 I know a lot of you participated in those two 13 open houses that occurred. I think it was about a year, 14 year ago, year and a half ago at the airport. During the 15 peak periods at the airport, it's a crowded facility. 16 It's old. It's smaller than a modern airport would be if 17 it were designed right now. 18 Peak periods, there's a lot of foot traffic 19 going through there. Circulation is sometimes difficult, 20 and that could potentially lead, especially under the 21 optimized flight scenario, to potential safety hazards. 22 The proposed project though, as I mentioned, would help to 23 alleviate concerns about those. 24 Significant impacts could also occur, as I 25 said, under the optimized flight scenario not only because</p> <p style="text-align: right;">31</p>
<p>1 with all pertinent local and state construction and 2 building requirement and regulations, including the 3 Uniform Building Code. 4 What we concluded in the EIR was that the 5 terminal building does contain asbestos and could also 6 contain lead-based paint; that Parcel O may contain the 7 aerially deposited lead and trace amounts of DDT. 8 I didn't mention that earlier, but in the past, 9 the grassy areas of the airport were treated with DDT. In 10 a fairly recent project, there were trace, trace amounts 11 of that found. So we haven't ruled out the possibility 12 that trace amounts could be found in this project, as 13 well. 14 During construction, those materials could be 15 released into the atmosphere in the vicinity of the 16 airport. The existing rules and procedures that are in 17 effect at the airport, plus the proposed mitigation 18 program, would ensure that those impacts are mitigated to 19 a level considered less than significant. 20 With regards to public services, the EIR 21 discusses fire and police protection, as well as 22 Transportation Security Administration, TSA, and airport 23 security activities at the airport. It also makes note of 24 the fact that TSA has requested improvements to enhance 25 their security at the airport, such as the enclosed</p> <p style="text-align: right;">30</p>	<p>1 you have more passengers, you have more baggage, more 2 crowded conditions and more changes to baggage security 3 screening unless the proposed project is implemented. 4 With regard to police and fire services, as 5 well as airport security services, all of those would be 6 -- the staffing levels would all be adjusted as necessary 7 to meet the changing demands of the airport. The City 8 already has the authorization and the procedures in place 9 to make sure that as more people are using the airport, 10 the staffing levels are up to the demands being placed on 11 them. 12 With that, I will introduce Vince Mestre, who 13 is already up here by me, and he's here to talk to you 14 about noise. 15 MR. MESTRE: This is a very brief summary of the 16 noise analysis that is contained in the EIR. EIR Section 17 3.6 is the noise analysis, and it contains much more 18 information than I can squeeze into this presentation. 19 The very detailed technical studies are contained in 20 Appendix F of the EIR. 21 The noise analysis can be summarized in two 22 figures. The first is this Exhibit 3.6-9 in the EIR. It 23 shows the existing noise contours for calendar year 2004. 24 There are 15 homes located in the 65 CNEL noise 25 contour. That's the noise land use standards used by the</p> <p style="text-align: right;">32</p>

<p>1 State of California and the City of Long Beach. That's 2 the yellow contour right here. There are no schools 3 within the 65 or 60 CNEL contour. 4 The next slide is a close-up of this slide 5 because the other slide was just too far away to see what 6 was going on. This is the area north of the runway, north 7 of the airport. 8 Those are the homes that are within the 65 CNEL 9 contour or touched by the 65 CNEL contour north of the 10 airport. This is Carson and Cherry Street. South of the 11 airport, this is Clark and I-405. These are the 12 residential lots that are just touched by this 65 CNEL 13 contour. 14 We looked at future conditions with this 15 project and identified that this project would not affect 16 future conditions. The Long Beach Airport Noise Ordinance 17 establishes a noise budget for the airlines and cargo 18 operators. That budget permits at least 41 air carrier 19 departures per day -- and that includes cargo departures 20 -- and 25 commuter departures per day. 21 In 2004, 41 air carrier departures were 22 allocated, and on weekdays, that level was reached. The 23 25 commuter flights is not being used. 24 The noise budget permits more flights if the 25 airlines operate below the noise budget. How many more</p> <p>33</p>	<p>1 11 additional commercial flights and 25 commuter flights, 2 there are 11 homes within the 65 CNEL contour. There are 3 also two schools that fall within the 60 CNEL contour. 4 These include the Minnie Gant Elementary School and the 5 special education building at the School Safety and 6 Emergency Preparedness offices. 7 I'll show a close-up of these two areas. This 8 is a close-up -- changed on me. 9 This is a close-up of the Minnie Gant School 10 showing part of the 60 CNEL contour that falls on part of 11 the school property. 12 Next slide. 13 This shot, slide, shows the special ed 14 building, which is right at the tip of this arrow just 15 under the 60 CNEL contour green line. Can't see the 16 building because it's under the line. And this special ed 17 building falls just -- it's just touching the 60 CNEL 18 contour. This is the Log Coyotes Diagonal. This is Clark 19 Avenue. This is where the 65 CNEL contour is. 20 The next slide shows -- back up two slides. I 21 think there's one -- think you jumped over one. 22 Here we go. This slide shows the close-up of 23 residential houses that are within the 65 CNEL contour for 24 the case of additional 11 air carrier flights and 25 25 commuter flights. There are no homes within the 65</p> <p>35</p>
<p>1 flights could be realized if the airlines and cargo 2 operators used the quietest aircraft available to them and 3 they reduced the number of nighttime violations is an 4 issue that is addressed in detail in the EIR. 5 That analysis shows that under ideal but 6 realistic assumptions, as many as 11 additional commercial 7 flights could be accommodated. Of course, these 8 additional flights would have to be of the quietest 9 aircraft types and not at the night hours. 10 The potential future case that was analyzed in 11 the EIR is a case where the 11 additional commercial 12 flights are realized and the 25 commuter flights occur. 13 This shows the noise contours for that future potential 14 optimized condition. That's Exhibit 3.6 dash 14 from the 15 EIR. 16 And again, the yellow contour is the 65, the 60 17 is the green, and the inner contour, which is purple, is 18 contained mostly within the airport boundary, is the 70 19 CNEL contour. 20 Most importantly, achieving the budget 21 potential of 11 additional commercial flights and 25 22 commuter flights is not dependent on this project. Can 23 these additional flights occur without this project? The 24 answer is yes. 25 For the case of future potential contours with</p> <p>34</p>	<p>1 contour under that condition north of the airport. These 2 are the 11 homes that would then fall under the 65 CNEL 3 contour south of the airport. 4 Even though the potential future noise contours 5 can be achieved with or without this project, a mitigation 6 measure has been identified that is mitigation measure 3.6 7 dash 2. 8 Within 24 months of certification of the EIR, 9 the airport shall develop a sound insulation program for 10 homes within the 65 CNEL contour and schools within the 60 11 CNEL contour. Sound insulation and treatment generally 12 includes sound-rated windows and doors and other 13 modifications to ensure an interior noise environment that 14 meets state and local noise limits. 15 Construction noise analyses are also included 16 in the EIR. Any night construction on Parcel O will 17 require noise monitoring, and if City noise limits are 18 exceeded, construction will have to stop until a 19 construction mitigation plan is implemented. 20 Janet Harvey will now discuss the traffic 21 analysis. 22 MS. HARVEY: Thank you. 23 For the project, the terminal improvement 24 project in and of itself, you know, a bigger building 25 would not cause an increase in traffic, but additional</p> <p>36</p>

<p>1 trips would result in the optimized flight scenario due to 2 the additional passengers.</p> <p>3 So for the traffic study, we did an evaluation 4 of the optimized flight scenario. The study area that we 5 looked at extends from Carson on the north, Willow to the 6 south, Cherry on the west side, and Clark on the east 7 side. It also includes that new exit on the south side of 8 Donald Douglas Drive onto Lakewood Boulevard.</p> <p>9 Our traffic study assumptions, again, assume 10 the optimized flight conditions, which is 52 commercial 11 and 25 commuter flights, the new exit on southbound 12 Lakewood Boulevard. The parking demand for the project is 13 based on 2.75 spaces per 1,000 departing passengers, which 14 was from a study that was done earlier for the airport.</p> <p>15 The number of vehicle trips for the optimized 16 flight conditions was based on existing passenger data, 17 and it was also compared to John Wayne and Ontario 18 airports, and it was found to be very similar to their 19 trip generation rates.</p> <p>20 The traffic study looked at two different time 21 periods. For the CEQA analysis, we looked at existing 22 with the project with optimized flights, which would be 23 like we wake up tomorrow and the buildings are there and 24 the optimized flights are underway. It's not a very 25 realistic thing to say it's going to happen tomorrow, but</p> <p style="text-align: right;">37</p>	<p>1 commercial and 25 commuter.</p> <p>2 So therefore, a parking deficiency would exist 3 in future 2020 conditions, but the proposed project 4 supplies more parking than not doing anything than the new 5 project conditions.</p> <p>6 So when we think about it that way, the new 7 project has less parking and would cause more drop-off 8 trips because if you didn't have a place to park, you're 9 going to have to get to the airport somehow. So it may be 10 a taxi or a relative or friend or someone who takes you to 11 the airport, drops you off, but then they have to come 12 back again when you arrive back and pick you back up.</p> <p>13 So in the with-project conditions, there's more 14 parking. Therefore, there will be less drop-off trips.</p> <p>15 So the results for the 2020 analysis showed 16 that the proposed project with its additional project 17 actually generates fewer trips than no-project conditions 18 because more people can drive to the airport and have a 19 place to park with fewer drop-offs, and each drop-off trip 20 is twice as many trips as if you just drove to the airport 21 and parked yourself.</p> <p>22 Therefore, the optimized flight scenario 23 results in added trips, but the project itself does not 24 result in any significant traffic impacts.</p> <p>25 And now I'm going to turn it over to John,</p> <p style="text-align: right;">39</p>
<p>1 that was one analysis period.</p> <p>2 And then we also looked at 2020 conditions with 3 optimized flights and compared the with project in place 4 and without the project in place. The 2020 analysis also 5 assumes that Douglas Park is built and open and their 6 traffic is on the local roads. And it also assumes that 7 the Douglas Park Roadway mitigation measures are in place.</p> <p>8 For the existing plus project with optimized 9 flights or it's there tomorrow, the findings assume that 10 the existing off-site parking, lot D, the space leased 11 from Boeing, will still be available for use. And under 12 these conditions, we identified two impacted 13 intersections, Lakewood at Spring and Lakewood at Willow. 14 Mitigation measures were recommended as the passenger 15 numbers increased to a point where the impact would be 16 significant.</p> <p>17 And then we looked at the 2020 conditions with 18 the optimized flights. We assumed that due to the 19 short-term nature of the Boeing lot D parking area, no 20 off-site parking is available.</p> <p>21 And when the City originally looked at this 22 project and the proposed parking structure, it was based 23 on parking needs for the 41 plus 25 flights, which would 24 be, you know, from the noise impact deal in the ordinance, 25 not the optimized flights, which would be the 52</p> <p style="text-align: right;">38</p>	<p>1 who's going to discuss air quality and the health risk 2 assessment.</p> <p>3 MR. PEHRSON: One you've all been waiting for, huh? 4 We're almost done, folks.</p> <p>5 Air quality impact analysis and human health 6 risk assessment began with the development of a model and 7 protocol. This protocol was reviewed by the California 8 Air Resources Board and the South Coast Air Quality 9 Management District.</p> <p>10 They provided comments. We incorporated their 11 comments and resubmitted the protocol for their review. 12 AQMD provided additional comments, and we addressed those 13 in a final protocol.</p> <p>14 The protocol describes the models and methods 15 used, it describes the CEQA significant thresholds that 16 are compared to, and it defines the human health risk 17 assessment exposure parameters used in the risk 18 calculations.</p> <p>19 These are the criteria air pollutants that are 20 analyzed in the analysis. These are criteria pollutants 21 defined in the Clean Air Act. In addition to these, we 22 also looked at lead, which is also a criteria pollutant, 23 and we addressed that as both a criteria pollutant and a 24 toxic air contaminant.</p> <p>25 These are the toxic air contaminants that were</p> <p style="text-align: right;">40</p>

<p>1 addressed in the human health risk assessment. There are 2 approximately 20 compounds here. However, pH's actually 3 represented another seven compounds. So over 25 compounds 4 were addressed.</p> <p>5 The human health risk assessment exposure 6 parameters that were included in the analysis are based on 7 South Coast AQMD requirements. These two receptor types 8 had to be addressed: Adult residents, 70-year exposure. 9 They are assumed to live in the house 350 days per year 10 for the 70 years, and we had to assume that they were 11 located at both residents and at schools.</p> <p>12 Worker exposures. Were assumed that the worker 13 work at the same facility for 40 years for 245 days per 14 year, and these were located in all the commercial and 15 industrial sites both on and off the airport.</p> <p>16 Additional receptors included a resident adult 17 plus child, which assumed that the child lived in the 18 house and then grew up to be an adult.</p> <p>19 We also looked at school children at the school 20 sites.</p> <p>21 Back up just once more.</p> <p>22 After analyzing all of these receptor types for 23 all of the exposures, we did not generate any calculated 24 health risks that were above the significant thresholds 25 defined by CEQA.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">41</p>	<p>1 auxiliary power units would reduce the CO impacts to a 2 level below significant. However, the NOx emissions would 3 still be significant after mitigation.</p> <p>4 With that, I will turn it back to Kathleen.</p> <p>5 MS. BRADY: Thank you. That concludes our 6 presentation today, and as Chris indicated, that the 7 public review period extends from November 7th to 8 December 22nd.</p> <p>9 And this is in your handout, but here's the 10 addresses where you can submit comments in writing. The 11 process does provide that all the comments are received 12 during the public review period, which includes any public 13 comments made tonight will be responded to in writing and 14 will be a component of the final EIR.</p> <p>15 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.</p> <p>16 Well, with that, thank you, and thank you for 17 being patient. Again, those of you that came in a little 18 late, I would like to welcome you and again thank you for 19 taking your time out of your busy week, on a Tuesday night 20 especially.</p> <p>21 My name is Chris Eberhard, and from here we're 22 going to take your public comments regarding the findings 23 that they have just highlighted.</p> <p>24 I would like to mention again for those of you 25 that came in late that Mary is our court reporter, and the</p> <p style="text-align: right;">43</p>
<p>1 We'll go to the impacts that we did find in the 2 analysis. The air quality impact analysis identified 3 construction impacts that exceeded the significant 4 thresholds for NOx and VOC. A number of mitigation 5 measures have been recommended. I believe 11 are actually 6 in the document, but we did not believe that these would 7 reduce the impacts to levels considered less than 8 significant, so there would be an insignificant impact 9 after mitigation.</p> <p>10 The increased flight activity under the 11 optimized flight scenario would result in exceedance of 12 the PM10 concentration thresholds developed by AQMD. The 13 area is a non-human area, so it has very stringent 14 thresholds for PM10.</p> <p>15 So the sources of the PM10 are primarily the 16 diesel-powered GSC, ground support equipment, and fugitive 17 re-entrained road dust.</p> <p>18 Again, there are mitigation measures proposed, 19 but it's not considered that these would be below the 20 level of significance after mitigation.</p> <p>21 And then finally, emissions of CO and NOx from 22 aircraft auxiliary power units and the ground support 23 equipment were shown to be significant before mitigation. 24 However, use of electric ground support equipment and 25 preconditioned air and gate power to reduce the use of the</p> <p style="text-align: right;">42</p>	<p>1 best way that we can help tonight is to make sure that she 2 gets your comments accurately.</p> <p>3 So I will ask if there are side conversations 4 or whatever, that you take them outside because acoustics 5 are a little interesting, and I know she had trouble from 6 time to time hearing the technical report.</p> <p>7 Kathleen just had it up there, but I will 8 remind you again that the review period ends 9 December 22nd, and the comments that are received tonight 10 and at the other meetings and in writing and through the 11 e-mails will be addressed in the final document.</p> <p>12 There are comment cards. There's a comment box 13 you can put your comments in over there. I think there 14 are plenty of comment cards in the front if you didn't get 15 them and you're more comfortable making your comments that 16 way or through the e-mail.</p> <p>17 I will mention one more time also -- I believe 18 it's in your material, but there are three meetings. The 19 next one is Saturday from 9:00 a.m. till 1:00 p.m. For 20 those of you that are interested in attending again or for 21 your neighbors, you can let them know they're Saturday 22 morning and then Monday evening again 6:00 p.m. to 9:00 23 p.m. Saturday's meeting is at the City Council chambers, 24 and Monday night's meeting is at the Petroleum Club, and I 25 have the address here. It is 3636 Linden Avenue,</p> <p style="text-align: right;">44</p>

<p>1 Petroleum Club.</p> <p>2 I would like to know about how many of you plan</p> <p>3 to speak because that will tell me about how long I can</p> <p>4 let each of you go. If you all want to speak, we'll have</p> <p>5 to limit it more. So if I could just see -- and you can</p> <p>6 change your mind, but it will give me an idea.</p> <p>7 How many of you do plan to speak? Well, we</p> <p>8 should have time, I think, to be able to go probably to</p> <p>9 five minutes. Now, if you start lining up, then I may</p> <p>10 have to as we go limit that, but I think there's -- we</p> <p>11 have about two hours, or a little less. And again,</p> <p>12 remember that you can also do comment cards.</p> <p>13 I wanted to also let you know that certainly</p> <p>14 once you're done speaking, you can feel free to leave, go</p> <p>15 home and go watch some television or whatever your plans</p> <p>16 are for the evening. This basically, other than the</p> <p>17 comments, is the end of the formal portion of the meeting.</p> <p>18 So I will set it at right now as a five-minute</p> <p>19 time limit. Do try to keep your comments as brief as</p> <p>20 possible. We will take all of your comments tonight, but</p> <p>21 we are particularly and the court reporter is here to take</p> <p>22 comments regarding the findings in the draft document,</p> <p>23 your thoughts on the draft document.</p> <p>24 Each speaker needs to give their name and</p> <p>25 address for the court reporter and I guess speak into the</p> <p style="text-align: right;">45</p>	<p>1 But if it's clarifying in terms of the project</p> <p>2 description, that's possible.</p> <p>3 MS. DELATORRE: My name is Birgit Delatorre,</p> <p>4 B-i-r-g-i-t D-e-l-a-t-o-r-r-e. I'm here today as a</p> <p>5 resident, as well as a Director of the Board of Council</p> <p>6 PTA's of Long Beach, and my first question relates to the</p> <p>7 PTA's involvement in this.</p> <p>8 We had come to the scoping meetings with a</p> <p>9 request that the EIR would look at the health impacts on</p> <p>10 children, recognizing that children would be affected in a</p> <p>11 different way than adults due to their physiology and</p> <p>12 their activity level, and I did not see that addressed in</p> <p>13 the EIR.</p> <p>14 MS. EBERHARD: Just go ahead with your comments.</p> <p>15 MS. DELATORRE: Okay. All right. There's a slide</p> <p>16 -- well, you have a slide that talks about that the EIR</p> <p>17 determined the proposed project to be environmentally</p> <p>18 superior. Unfortunately, a little confusing to me, some</p> <p>19 of the key points on the slide, and I just wanted</p> <p>20 clarification.</p> <p>21 "Environmentally superior," does that relate</p> <p>22 solely to the energy efficiency, such as converting ground</p> <p>23 equipment to electric? Is that the main point that the</p> <p>24 determination of "environmentally superior" is based on?</p> <p>25 I have EIR reference bottom slide on page</p> <p style="text-align: right;">47</p>
<p>1 mike, which maybe wasn't doing real well for a minute.</p> <p>2 One speaker at a time. Again, that's to help her to get</p> <p>3 this all down. I mentioned going outside so there isn't</p> <p>4 too much noise in the room. And, of course, let's all be</p> <p>5 courteous and respectful of any view that is given.</p> <p>6 And if you do go beyond five minutes -- should</p> <p>7 be way more than enough for most of you. But if you do go</p> <p>8 to the five minutes, I may need to interrupt just so that</p> <p>9 we can hear everyone.</p> <p>10 With that, give your name and spell it with</p> <p>11 your address. And I'll remind you as you come up. That's</p> <p>12 my role tonight.</p> <p>13 So with that, who would like to -- and if you</p> <p>14 would like to make it move a little faster, you can</p> <p>15 certainly line one or two up behind the speaker so that</p> <p>16 you're ready to go, and that will reduce the time also.</p> <p>17 Yes, ma'am.</p> <p>18 MS. DELATORRE: I have a quick question before I</p> <p>19 start my questions. There's no chance to get any kind of</p> <p>20 clarification tonight on any of the questions? Most of</p> <p>21 mine are questions, not just comments.</p> <p>22 MS. EBERHARD: Why don't you go ahead and pose your</p> <p>23 questions, and if they're clarifying kind, it's possible</p> <p>24 that we can get an answer. But basically, I think the</p> <p>25 consultants are here to listen.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">46</p>	<p>1 seven. I needed clarification. It says, "Air quality</p> <p>2 impacts will remain significant." Again, that was kind of</p> <p>3 a confusing slide. Throughout really, there's discussion</p> <p>4 about construction impacts and airport operation impacts.</p> <p>5 Many of the slides I think are quite confusing as to what</p> <p>6 are you talking about, and you're talking about</p> <p>7 construction, or are you talking about airport operations</p> <p>8 now and then, that sort of thing?</p> <p>9 So anyway, on this page seven, bottom slide,</p> <p>10 "air quality impacts will remain significant." I need to</p> <p>11 know if that will be during construction only or if that</p> <p>12 would be after the proposed project has been completed and</p> <p>13 the airport operations at that time.</p> <p>14 MR. PEHRSON: I'll give you a quick clarification.</p> <p>15 The construction slide was for the construction</p> <p>16 of the terminal project itself, so those impacts would go</p> <p>17 away or stop once construction was completed. The other</p> <p>18 slide was looking at the optimized flight scenario and</p> <p>19 whether there would be impacts associated with optimized</p> <p>20 flights.</p> <p>21 So when we said "significant after mitigation"</p> <p>22 for operations, what this was referring to is an optimized</p> <p>23 flight scenario where you get 52 commercial flights and 25</p> <p>24 commuters, and that would be ongoing impacts.</p> <p>25 MS. DELATORRE: I would have to look at that again.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">48</p>

<p>1 Honestly, I am completely -- this is the first time I've</p> <p>2 ever looked at something like this, and you guys are</p> <p>3 experts, and it's probably second nature to you, and it's</p> <p>4 not to me.</p> <p>5 So as far as health impact after the proposed</p> <p>6 project has been completed, then you still have</p> <p>7 significant -- there's one slide that says there will be</p> <p>8 significant and unavoidable impacts on air quality.</p> <p>9 Everything else can be mitigated, but there will be</p> <p>10 significant and unavoidable after everything is said and</p> <p>11 done.</p> <p>12 Okay, that's -- I wanted to make sure that that</p> <p>13 related to after construction.</p> <p>14 And would you clarify "unavoidable"? Maybe not</p> <p>15 now, but --</p> <p>16 MS. EBERHARD: Exactly the kind of thing -- you got</p> <p>17 it right. That will be in the comments.</p> <p>18 MS. DELATORRE: In the EIR, did you consider the</p> <p>19 possibility that there will be 500-passenger jets coming</p> <p>20 in, as Jet Blue has said in various New York meetings,</p> <p>21 that they're just waiting for this terminal to be expanded</p> <p>22 so they can do that? Again, no answer today.</p> <p>23 And if you have considered it or if you have</p> <p>24 considered the 500-passenger jets, does the EIR consider</p> <p>25 the undoubtedly increased traffic from these cars coming</p> <p style="text-align: right;">49</p>	<p>1 Next?</p> <p>2 MR. BAUCH: My name is Michael Bauch, last name</p> <p>3 B-a-u-c-h, on Chapman Avenue here in Long Beach. You</p> <p>4 know, I've been following this issue for quite a while,</p> <p>5 been going to a lot of the meetings.</p> <p>6 I think a lot of the neighborhood people here</p> <p>7 really would like some more time to review this EIR. I</p> <p>8 think a lot of us feel that the 45 days is really rushing</p> <p>9 a very big decision, and especially during the holidays.</p> <p>10 Definitely need some more time to take a look at this.</p> <p>11 One of the other concerns is, you know, we've</p> <p>12 just noticed that we've got a lot more late night flights</p> <p>13 coming in, those coming in between 10:00 and 11:00, and</p> <p>14 we're just very concerned about having an airport that's</p> <p>15 this much bigger.</p> <p>16 How can this help these late night flights</p> <p>17 coming in? We're concerned that it's only going to</p> <p>18 increase that.</p> <p>19 One of the other comments I heard was about</p> <p>20 noiseproofing some of the buildings, and that's also a</p> <p>21 concern. We're wondering, well, it's almost like</p> <p>22 admitting there's going to be more noise because some of</p> <p>23 the buildings will have to be noiseproofed, many of the</p> <p>24 houses surrounding that.</p> <p>25 And I believe that that's part of the reason we</p> <p style="text-align: right;">51</p>
<p>1 in?</p> <p>2 And as far as air quality mitigation, has the</p> <p>3 EIR considered mitigating to some sort of a shuttle</p> <p>4 service as opposed to having a whole bunch of cars coming</p> <p>5 in? And if not, is there a reason why it wasn't</p> <p>6 considered?</p> <p>7 That's it for today.</p> <p>8 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.</p> <p>9 Next?</p> <p>10 MS. BYNUM. Good evening. My name is Luann Bynum.</p> <p>11 Is live at 651 Ultimo Avenue here in Long Beach. Bynum,</p> <p>12 B-y-n-u-m.</p> <p>13 I'm here tonight on behalf of the Long Beach</p> <p>14 Alliance. Some of you are aware of this organization.</p> <p>15 We've been working for reasonable improvements at the</p> <p>16 terminals at the airport, and we're asking tonight that</p> <p>17 the EIR be certified as a valid comprehensive and</p> <p>18 thoughtful document.</p> <p>19 We believe it was a thorough study by</p> <p>20 experienced professionals, and we believe it addressed and</p> <p>21 appropriately mitigated the concerns addressed by the</p> <p>22 neighborhoods, City Planning, general public and</p> <p>23 government agencies.</p> <p>24 Thank you.</p> <p>25 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">50</p>	<p>1 moved to Long Beach is not to be boxed in our houses, but</p> <p>2 to get to enjoy the outdoors. So just putting some</p> <p>3 noiseproofing on a house doesn't solve the problem.</p> <p>4 I think the biggest issue here is this EIR is</p> <p>5 assuming that the noise ordinance is going to stay, and I</p> <p>6 think a lot of us in the neighborhoods are scared that</p> <p>7 perhaps this noise ordinance will not last forever and</p> <p>8 that there will be -- there will be chances that something</p> <p>9 will happen to the noise ordinance, and then all the</p> <p>10 sudden we have an airport that's tripled its size waiting</p> <p>11 to accommodate more flights, and I think that's a very big</p> <p>12 concern.</p> <p>13 So I hope some of these issues are addressed.</p> <p>14 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.</p> <p>15 MR. CONLEY: Hi. My name is Steven Conley,</p> <p>16 C-o-n-l-e-y, 311 Long Point in Long Beach.</p> <p>17 I have some concerns with regard to the</p> <p>18 environment and conservation, and I want to give a little</p> <p>19 background on myself. I'm speaking for myself and not for</p> <p>20 the organizations I might be affiliated with.</p> <p>21 I'm president of the Long Beach Water</p> <p>22 Commission, and I'm also a director of the Aquarium of the</p> <p>23 Pacific, and I'm also a member of the Scientific Diving</p> <p>24 Team there.</p> <p>25 And I mention those only because having those</p> <p style="text-align: right;">52</p>

<p>1 experiences has given me a great deal of understanding and 2 appreciation for conservation and the whole environmental 3 issue, and there's one element in the EIR that I think has 4 sort of been overlooked and not enough attention has been 5 given. 6 But it is vitally important that we continue or 7 we don't reduce the number of aircraft parking positions. 8 The EIR calls for 14 aircraft parking positions. If 9 that's reduced, we have more aircraft idling waiting to 10 get into position, which from a conservation point of view 11 means more fuel burned and from an environmental point of 12 view means more exhaust and fumes in the air. 13 I really hope that no matter what comes out of 14 this, there is not a reduction in 14 spaces because from 15 an environmental and a conservation point of view, they 16 are -- that number of stations which have special 17 electrical hookups and such is vitally important. 18 Thank you. 19 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you. 20 MS. RUSNAK: Good evening. My name is Susan Rusnak. 21 That's R-u-s-n-a-k. My business office is 111 West Ocean 22 Boulevard in Long Beach, 90802. 23 I'm here this evening representing the City of 24 Long Beach Economic Development Commission. I am 25 presently serving as chair of the business development</p>	<p>1 not result in substantially greater impacts than the other 2 build alternatives, end quote, and declares the proposed 3 improvements as, quote, the environmentally superior 4 alternative, end quote. 5 Due to the profound positive economic impact 6 that the airport operations have on continued vitality of 7 this city, the Economic Development Commission 8 respectfully urges the City to act without further delay 9 or impediment to the process to approve the EIR and move 10 forward to improve and modernize the Long Beach airport. 11 Thank you very much for your attention. 12 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you. 13 Next. 14 MS. SOPO: Hi. My name is Linda Sopo. I reside at 15 3061 Armourdale Avenue in Long Beach, and I'm here with 16 mixed emotions tonight because I've been coming to these 17 things for two and a half years, and much like Birgit 18 brought up a few minutes ago, one of the things that we 19 need you guys to do was look at the impact to our 20 children. 21 There was a study done about asthma and cancer 22 in Long Beach. It was printed in the New England Journal 23 of Medicine, it's been brought up at several meetings, and 24 I see nothing about the children in here and the kids that 25 are living while their lungs are developing living in Los</p>
<p>1 committee of that commission, and we've been following the 2 airport issue for about the last year. 3 I'd like to read a statement on behalf of the 4 Commission. 5 The role of the Long Beach Economic Development 6 Commission is to advise and make recommendations to the 7 City on matters affecting economic development. The City 8 of Long Beach Economic Development Commission recommends 9 timely and immediate action to certify the draft 10 Environmental Impact Report. 11 The Long Beach Airport is an important and 12 essential asset and sustains the City's economic growth 13 and viability. The economic impact analysis published in 14 April 2005 presented persuasive evidence that continued 15 airport operations have substantial positive impacts on 16 the City's long term business growth and work force 17 development. 18 As this report concluded, the airport is a 19 fundamental element of the City's employment base, 20 producing over 16,000 jobs and representing one billion in 21 earnings. 22 The Commission has reviewed the draft 23 Environmental Impact Report, including the detailed 24 project impacts and mitigation measures presented. The 25 report concludes that the proposed project, quote, does</p>	<p>1 Altos, in Bixby and Cal Heights. We know about a 2 70-year-old man that lives there, but in my judgment, that 3 is not quite. And what about the impacts on kids and 4 their lungs development? 5 The other part, I was pleased to hear that you 6 mentioned Minnie Gant having mitigation, but my question 7 was as I was going through this, I heard mitigation, 8 mitigation, mitigation, mitigation. Who's paying for the 9 mitigation? 10 And in hearing about -- I have to disagree with 11 Ms. Bynum. I think that there are areas that we've been 12 asking for in this that you guys have not addressed that 13 are real concerns, and people want to be able to go in 14 their backyards. They don't want to deal with additional 15 noise. And it would be awful if all those kids in Minnie 16 Gant would have to stay in the classroom. And then we 17 have to worry if those planes are actually going to make 18 it as they go overhead. 19 So it's really to get practical here, but 20 realities ruin people's lives. 21 Finally, in terms of the economic impact, I 22 agree. I love our airport. I think it's great, and I 23 think it's a lot of good things. I love flying in, I love 24 flying out of it. I like our drop-off. I think the last 25 thing anybody in Long Beach really wants after this is</p>

<p>1 park and pay for parking a couple days while they go fly. 2 The drop-off makes it -- it's kind of like going through 3 the drive-up teller or the drive-up pharmacy at night. 4 It's been wonderful over these years to be able to come 5 in, drop off and go. So that's on the other side of it. 6 Thank you very much. Please, again, address 7 the issues to the kids and their health. 8 MS. EBERHARD: Could you give the spelling of your 9 name, Mrs. Sopo? 10 MS. SOPO: It's so easy. S-o-p-o. 11 Thank you. 12 MS. SELLMER: Yes, my name is Laura Sellmer, 13 S-e-l-l-m-e-r. My address is 5474 Daggett. 14 Number one, I think that having the EIR public 15 comment period over the holidays needs to be changed. 16 I think we need to end that. Bring in the public involved 17 through the January period, so extending out to the end of 18 January. 19 I think it's a matter of the City policy when a 20 project has such a profound impact on residents of a 21 community, that it's a suspicious thing to put that public 22 hearing right in the middle of Thanksgiving and Christmas. 23 So I think as City policy, we need to extend that out. 24 I think by law, you can extend it up to 365 25 days, so to pick the minimum 45 right during the holidays,</p> <p style="text-align: right;">57</p>	<p>1 model used brought factors in from out Ventura County. 2 And I think if we really wanted to have an economic impact 3 at the Long Beach airport, we really need to look at a 4 study that involves, you know, what the economic impact to 5 Long Beach is, and that study needs to have public input, 6 too. 7 The oversight committee were all pro-airport 8 expansion people, and it was a closed kind of study group. 9 So I would say to the Economic Development Commission that 10 that particular study may not be in the best interests of 11 Long Beach residents. 12 And one more thing. The air quality 13 monitoring, I understand CARB and Southern California Air 14 Quality Management did indicate that we need to have air 15 quality monitoring at the airport, but I think there was a 16 large outcry that citizens around Long Beach wanted to 17 have air quality monitoring. 18 The current monitoring is upwind of the 19 airport, and I know when those jets are running up their 20 engines getting ready to take off, all that jet emission 21 is pouring out into residential areas, and I think the 22 residents deserve to know what is the air quality and not 23 take models that are upwind of the actual airport 24 property. 25 It seems so obvious that that didn't happen,</p> <p style="text-align: right;">59</p>
<p>1 I think that's wrong. Needs to change. 2 That being said -- because right now we do have 3 comments closing on the 22nd. What is that, two days 4 before Christmas? I'm going to address the lead 5 component. I see here in the overview of the guiding 6 principles for the airport do not include the -- it's kind 7 of tucked in at the back paragraph. 8 And I think as the City of Long Beach as a 9 member of the U.S. Rebuilding Council, that you need to 10 put that component as a guiding principle. 11 And I think that if you would have done that, 12 if the City had taken that into effect, the largest 13 terminal, if all is being equal, that is never the 14 environmentally superior because it takes more energy to 15 heat a building, it takes more energy to cool a building, 16 it takes more resources to clean a building, and all those 17 are what drive the lead component because we're trying to 18 build buildings that are really friendlier to the 19 environment. 20 Small points here. Regarding the economic 21 impact study, I think that's a little misplaced here, the 22 comments earlier. That was another study earlier that -- 23 but because it was brought up, I will address it. 24 That study was a -- methodology was an older 25 version. There was no public input in that study. The</p> <p style="text-align: right;">58</p>	<p>1 but I think as an environmental impact report, our 2 citizens need to have that understanding of what the 3 environmental impact is at the airport. 4 Thank you. 5 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you. 6 Next? 7 MR. VILLANI: Good evening. My name is Daniel 8 Villani, V, as in Victor, I-l-l-a-n-i. I live at 9 305 Corona Avenue, C-o-r-o-n-a, in Long Beach. 10 I love the airport. I have been flying -- I 11 don't think since 9/11 I have flown out of LAX more than 12 one time. Business has taken me to the east coast a lot 13 since then. 14 I have a couple of points. Gonna start the 15 clock. 16 One, I strongly recommend that in the study 17 documents, in the written comments, that the term 18 "significant" is explained more in layman's terms because 19 as an engineer, I know that something can be called 20 significant if it's the great big dominant factor. 21 It can also be called significant -- if you're 22 looking at a whole bunch of noise and you see one little 23 blip barely visible in the noise, you can call that 24 significant, too. 25 And I don't know whether it's a blip that can</p> <p style="text-align: right;">60</p>

<p>1 be detected or if it's very significant. Very layman's 2 term, "significant effect." I suspect that it's down in 3 the blip range myself, but that needs to be clarified in 4 the report because "significant" can mean -- can have 5 emotionally charged impact.</p> <p>6 Second, I think everybody needs to remember -- 7 and it's unfortunate, I think, that the environmental 8 impact report mixed up optimal flights and the airport 9 improvements because nothing in the improvements can 10 increase the number of flights. We could put in a theme 11 park at Long Beach Airport, and it would not improve -- 12 increase the number of flights.</p> <p>13 Nothing will increase the number of flights 14 except the airlines flying quieter. Nothing. Unless we 15 void the noise ordinance. And one of the most effective 16 ways that we can void the noise ordinance is for the City 17 of Long Beach to act in bad faith.</p> <p>18 Acting in bad faith would include things like 19 trying to make it such an unpleasant experience to fly out 20 of Long Beach Airport that it drives customers to other 21 airports, and if that is attempted, then the courts will 22 be able to see right through a ploy like that by 23 stirred-up residents who cheer for the tear-it-down 24 option, and that would result in voiding the noise 25 ordinance.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">61</p>	<p>1 Also, my comment would be "significant" means 2 something much different than I think maybe what you're 3 putting on your report. "Significant" to me means 4 significant and something to be looked at with 5 significance.</p> <p>6 In the report, it was mentioned that homes that 7 are located in the 65 CNEL would be insulated, double 8 paned windows. Am I correct on that, you'd mentioned 9 that? And that schools that were in the 60 CNEL, they 10 were to be insulated.</p> <p>11 And one question I have, would Minnie Gant 12 Elementary School -- that's in a 60 CNEL zone. Would that 13 be built today with today's standards?</p> <p>14 And I have children who have gone to Minnie 15 Gant Elementary School, and I -- they stopped the class if 16 the noise is too loud for several minutes. The pollution 17 from the planes there is certainly more than a home 18 heating unit at the time flying over the house.</p> <p>19 And I do want to say that anybody who would 20 rush to the microphone and endorse this draft EIR without 21 taking the time to study it sufficiently and giving all 22 sides time to sufficient -- to study sufficiently, I would 23 wonder where they were coming from.</p> <p>24 Thank you.</p> <p>25 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">63</p>
<p>1 So we want to keep it comfortable. We want to 2 act in good faith if you want to keep the noise ordinance 3 in place.</p> <p>4 My last point is that I want to remind people 5 that there was a study released by the Long Beach 6 Press-Telegram sometime within the last year. I kept my 7 copy for a while, but I've misplaced -- showing the 8 various sources of air pollution in the area, and it had, 9 no surprise, the port right up near the top, and somewhere 10 down around number 15 or 20 as contributed to Long Beach 11 air pollution was the airport, and it was down below home 12 heating as a source of air pollution.</p> <p>13 Now, we live in Southern California. We know 14 how much we burn to heat our homes, and the airport is 15 below that. We need to remember that.</p> <p>16 I think that pretty much sums up my points. 17 Thank you very much.</p> <p>18 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.</p> <p>19 MR. SOPO: Joe Sopo, S-o-p-o, 3061 Armourdale, Long 20 Beach.</p> <p>21 The City Council promised citizens of Long 22 Beach a prospective human health risk assessment. They 23 told the City staff to make sure that's provided in the 24 EIR. And my question to them would be where was the air 25 sampling gathered, how many places, how many mobile units?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">62</p>	<p>1 Next?</p> <p>2 MR. HUSO: Jeff Huso, 5310 Las Lomas, Long Beach.</p> <p>3 First of all, I was going to address what the 4 previous gentleman said about the need to be concerned 5 about keeping the ordinance in place. And City Attorney 6 Mike Mais has already said several times at many different 7 meetings that Long Beach is not required to accommodate 8 the airlines, that we can have this proposal C, which is 9 not expanding anything, and that's fine.</p> <p>10 If you think about it logically, why would we 11 be forced to pay money or they have to allow to 12 accommodate some corporations or something? That's not 13 what his opinion was, but people get uptight bringing that 14 up again.</p> <p>15 So here I am at meeting number 87, unpaid 16 meeting number 87. I think this Environmental Impact 17 Report is really a feasibility study rather than an 18 environmental impact report.</p> <p>19 I noticed one zero -- 1.0 is titled "Executive 20 Summary," so I guess I'm the executive that it's directed 21 to.</p> <p>22 And then it goes on -- the EIR goes on to 23 state, "Under optimal conditions." Anybody knows that 24 that's a slanted word, "optimal." I would have used 25 "maximum." That would have been neutral.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">64</p>

<p>1 EIR states under optimal conditions A, B or C, 2 that the result is going to be the same as far as the 3 number of flights that are going to be going out. 4 So A's got fourteen airplane parking spaces, 5 and C has got ten. They assume that having fourteen 6 spaces is going to result in no more flights than ten, but 7 that's their starting point they're basing this 8 environment impact report. 9 Since that's the primary concern of the 10 residents, having fourteen spaces instead of ten in a 11 bigger facility will tend to encourage airlines at some 12 point to get more flights in there. 13 They're starting with the assumption that ten 14 is going to go to fourteen and their facility is going to 15 be the same number of flights, resulting in the same 16 number of flights as ten, and then going on to tell us 17 that with the bigger facilities, and if you have bigger 18 facilities, it's going to more easily accommodate less 19 traffic on the ground, which is probably true. 20 But they missed the whole point of the main 21 concern when they said that the A and C will result in the 22 same number of flights. There is presently no support for 23 that. 24 I thought the presentation tonight generally 25 gave the legalistic point of view, you know. For example,</p> <p style="text-align: right;">65</p>	<p>1 not? 2 I guess that's it. Thank you. 3 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you. And could you spell your 4 last name one more time for her? 5 MR. HUSO: It's H-u-s-o. 6 MS. EBERHARD: Next? 7 MR. FRELEAUX: Good evening. My name is Daniel 8 Freleaux, F-r-e-l-e-a-u-s. I live at 5451 Stearns Street 9 in Los Altos area. I've lived in that general part of 10 town for better than 50 years. 11 I'd like to invite any business person that has 12 a shop on Ocean Avenue, come on over to Los Altos Shopping 13 Center and set up shop and try and hold conversation on 14 your telephone throughout the day. You'd be interrupted a 15 number of times. 16 Also, I'd like to invite anybody that lives in 17 Belmont Shore to come on down and live on Stearnlee or 18 Montair or Heather and see what it's like. I don't think 19 you have any legitimacy at this meeting. Okay. 20 As far as insulating 11 houses in the 65 -- I'm 21 sorry. I forgot what all the letters were, but it doesn't 22 make any difference because the sound insulation is a 23 small matter. 24 You feel the vibration. Goes through your 25 building. I've been there. I went to Minnie Gant. I've</p> <p style="text-align: right;">67</p>
<p>1 there's 60 homes, only 60 homes. Well, there's a lot more 2 than 60 houses that are within -- that can hear and be 3 affected by these flights. 4 But legally speaking, it's from the point of 5 view of feasibility study, you might be able to get away 6 with it legally. But then again, who is behind this 7 report that wants to -- since when is it about what they 8 can get away with legally? 9 And there again, you have the Airport 10 Commission that was appointed by the City Council that 11 already has given instructions to the airport management 12 to maximize the number of flights. City Council has 13 appointed the Airport Commission. The Airport Commission 14 selected the contractor that wrote the Environmental 15 impact Report. 16 Another thing that the speaker tonight 17 conveniently neglected to mention, that under 3.6, 18 residents getting noise amelioration for their -- and 19 sound treatment for their homes would be required to 20 accept in trade a noise easement over their properties. 21 And to the Alliance group, I would say since 22 you were the second one to speak, your representative, and 23 you said that the EIR addressed the residents' concern, of 24 which only one has spoken yet. And I hadn't spoken yet. 25 How do you know whether the EIR addressed my concerns or</p> <p style="text-align: right;">66</p>	<p>1 been on both sides of the landing and takeoff pattern. 2 Sometimes you seriously feel the vibration. 3 You don't -- I mean, hearing it is a secondary 4 matter. I have black soot that lands on my property from 5 the air -- I assume from the airplanes. I live far enough 6 away from the harbor that I doubt -- it may contribute, 7 but nonetheless. 8 I think that the idea that the airport is a 9 driving matter for Long Beach economy is absurd. It's 10 ludicrous. Long Beach has a vibrant population. It has a 11 university. It could have a lot more facilities for its 12 residents and perhaps not have to charge so much that 13 people really don't want to go downtown. 14 Anyways, I thank you for your time. 15 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you, sir. 16 Next? 17 MS. NADEAU: Hi, my name is Jane Nadeau. That's N, 18 as in Nancy, A, as in alpha, d, as in delta, e-a-u. I 19 live at 3933 Lemon in Bixby Knolls. 20 And as much as I have tried to get used to the 21 noise, that's not my main issue, although I really would 22 not like to have ten, twenty flights taking off 11:20, 23 1:30, and the lovely one this morning at 4:17 a.m. 24 My concern is the pollution, and I'm really 25 concerned that the EIR hasn't addressed it fully,</p> <p style="text-align: right;">68</p>

<p>1 especially since I've been told that it contains -- the 2 studies were used were from the seventies, and with the 3 paper saying on a daily basis that the AQMD and CEQA and 4 everybody -- not CEQA, but AQMD is saying that we have 5 some of the worst pollution in the area. And yes, I know 6 the port contributes significantly, and they're working on 7 it, allegedly.</p> <p>8 My concern is with the airport, and I too have 9 to keep windows closed because of the dust, and you can 10 wipe down our furniture all the time. It doesn't matter. 11 It's dirty the next day.</p> <p>12 And Hughes, Saint Barnabus and Longfellow 13 schools are in my neighborhood, and those kids are 14 impacted, and I'm really worried about that, and I think 15 you need more accurate data. You need to do a better 16 health risk assessment, especially when so many people are 17 being affected by asthma and cancer.</p> <p>18 And the 405 contributes, too. So does the 710. 19 But why are we going to add one more time without doing 20 some proper studies?</p> <p>21 Thanks.</p> <p>22 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.</p> <p>23 Other speakers?</p> <p>24 MS. LEISHMAN: My name is Julie Leishman, 25 L-e-i-s-h-m-a-n. I live at 1818 Greenbrier Road in the</p> <p style="text-align: right;">69</p>	<p>1 just looking at your study here, Exhibit 3, it's a 2 well-designed airport. I mean, it looks good. Look at 3 that. But if you go to Exhibit 5, Exhibit 4, it's 4 completely surrounded by neighborhoods.</p> <p>5 And so most places that you travel to, the 6 airport is located outside of the City, and so, I mean, 7 it's completely surrounded by neighborhoods.</p> <p>8 And I heard a while back from somebody -- I'm 9 five years in the neighborhood -- that originally, the 10 airport was being talked about being built out in the port 11 somewhere, which that would make sense to me, but I guess 12 we're beyond that.</p> <p>13 So I'm just in favor of Alternative C because 14 in 1941, the current airport was built and it was what, 15 35,000 feet? And they keep confusing the issue saying 16 that a no-build is 56,000 feet. 56,000 feet with the 17 tents and all that, that's what, 80 percent larger than 18 the original building.</p> <p>19 So to me that is -- that's what I'm in favor 20 for. Thanks.</p> <p>21 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.</p> <p>22 Next? I saw at least one more.</p> <p>23 MR. FUASICK: Good evening. My name is Kimball 24 Fuasick, K-i-m-b-a-l-l F-u-a-s-i-c-k. I live in the 3rd 25 District at 801 Lees Avenue.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">71</p>
<p>1 Los Altos area, and I work in Orange County, and I have a 2 lot of contact with people because I'm out in the field, 3 and I always ask everybody what they think of the Long 4 Beach Airport.</p> <p>5 And I know everybody complains that everybody 6 -- all the cheap people from Orange County come and use 7 the airport, but I would say 99 percent of the people that 8 I've talked to are very happy with the airport. They like 9 the convenience. They like to be able to come in and out, 10 to drop people off, and they're very happy with the Long 11 Beach Airport. That's one.</p> <p>12 The thing that I'm concerned about is Los Altos 13 is a cancer cluster, and there's been a lot of cancer 14 incidents just on my street alone, and I don't see where 15 that is addressed or how it's been addressed in this EIR.</p> <p>16 So my question would be how was that addressed 17 or where was that addressed? Because it is a problem. 18 Thank you.</p> <p>19 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you very much.</p> <p>20 Other speakers?</p> <p>21 MR. BROWN: My name is Thomas Brown, and I live at 22 7049 El Paseo, and I live in -- I work in Belmont Shores. 23 I'm a travel agent.</p> <p>24 And I just want to say I've been following it 25 -- I haven't participated, but I've been following it, and</p> <p style="text-align: right;">70</p>	<p>1 My home is located directly below the major 2 inbound flight path. I've lived in my current home for 19 3 years. I am concerned with things such as the appearance 4 of our airport, the CATs, the trailers and the lack of car 5 parking and security issues.</p> <p>6 But by far, my biggest concern is the 7 inadequate number of aircraft parking positions. I do fly 8 out of Long Beach quite a bit, and on numerous occasions 9 I've flown into Long Beach, arrived on time and then sat 10 on the tarmac for up to 20 minutes, jet engines still 11 running, waiting for a parking position.</p> <p>12 This makes absolutely no sense environmentally, 13 and I hope as a community, we can agree to proceed with 14 the improvements as soon as possible.</p> <p>15 Thank you.</p> <p>16 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.</p> <p>17 Sir?</p> <p>18 MR. HANSON: My name is Roy Hanson, H-a-n-s-o-n. I 19 live at 104 Santa Ana Avenue, Long Beach.</p> <p>20 I've been a resident of the county since 1941.</p> <p>21 Most of the folks here probably haven't, and most of them 22 probably got here because of the construction of freeways 23 and the variety of things that have made this a community 24 that's livable, and every one of those improvements 25 negatively impacted the environment to some degree.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">72</p>

<p>1 I don't see the trade-offs as -- the minor 2 impact of the improvements as significant, that they 3 shouldn't go forward with improving the airport. I've 4 used this airport a number of times to fly out, and it's a 5 wonderful service. It's much improved over other 6 airports. 7 And to provide for the modern needs in terms of 8 security, in terms of baggage handling, that seems 9 appropriate. Airport hasn't really been updated since 10 1941. Definitely needs some changes. I'm very much 11 supportive of improving the airport in terms of safety, 12 operations, convenience for people. 13 Most of the people that are probably speaking 14 against probably have never flown out of this airport. 15 Tends to be older people in the immediate neighborhood. 16 When they moved in those homes, they knew the airport was 17 there, and that's a fact. And there's a rare person that 18 was living in this area before 1941. 19 Very much supportive to the changes to the 20 airport that will accommodate reasonably people that need 21 to use it. 22 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you. 23 Other speakers? 24 MR. HUSO: I want to add something. 25 MS. EBERHARD: Okay, since we have time, you may, if</p> <p style="text-align: right;">73</p>	<p>1 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you. Anyone else? Okay, I see 2 a hand. 3 I will tell you when we're done with anyone 4 that wants to make presentation to the group, the court 5 reporter will be available to take your comments 6 individually if anyone wants to do that, assuming I think 7 we're doing very well on time. So she'll be here for 8 that. 9 Go ahead. 10 MS. BAUCH: I apologize I got here a little late 11 tonight, and I didn't actually get to hear, but from what 12 I can see on the report, I'm not really seeing a lot of 13 things that we requested and that we were so concerned 14 about that we expressed to our councilman, that we talked 15 about in meetings, and I would just like to reiterate that 16 for the record. 17 One of the things that comes to mind is the 18 sense of an environmental impact report, because we live 19 in the neighborhood, because everybody that lives in Long 20 Beach or nearby is impacted by the airport, by the 21 pollution that will be invented by an expanded airport. 22 I live in the neighborhood. It's fine with 23 improvements and reasonable improvements. We understand 24 that that's a necessity, but let's be reasonable. 25 And also, just saddens me that there wasn't a</p> <p style="text-align: right;">75</p>
<p>1 there are no other speakers that want to give their first 2 round. Anyone? 3 Okay, go ahead, sir. Identify yourself again 4 just so -- 5 MR. HUSO: Okay, Jeff Huso, H-u-s-o, again. 6 My family has lived in the neighborhood in the 7 house since before the airport was built. When I was a 8 kid, there was only basically the airport, airplane to 9 Avalon going over there. So it's not true that we take 10 what we get because we came here before the airport. 11 Speak for yourself. 12 And as far as somebody saying, well, I had to 13 wait 20 minutes, well, how would you like to have a house, 14 be concerned about somebody flying over your -- any time 15 they feel like it making noise when you're trying to relax 16 instead of 20 minutes you had to, Mr. Important, wait in 17 the airplane? 18 And as far as the ten new -- ten or fourteen 19 parking spaces, I'd rather have ten because I'd rather 20 have -- I'm mostly concerned about the noise coming from 21 the sky and a lot less concerned about the planes on the 22 ground. 23 And, yes, I have flown out of Long Beach 24 Airport more than once in the last year. 25 Okay, thank you.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">74</p>	<p>1 cumulative study done on traffic congestion, the freeway, 2 405, and the airport and everything that's going on that 3 could actually affect the environment in the next few 4 years with the expansion. So I just wanted to mention 5 that. 6 And also, to just mention that I think that 7 this is a little bit ridiculous to be pushing this item 8 during the holidays, and if we could at all wait 'til 9 January, that would be wonderful. 10 MS. EBERHARD: Could you just state your name and 11 address for the record? 12 MS. BAUCH: Oh, sure. Rachel Bauch, B-a-u-c-h, 13 2017 Chapman. 14 MS. EBERHARD: Okay. Anyone else? Our numbers are 15 dwindling, but we have time. I'll give you another minute 16 to think about it. Anyone? Any comments? 17 Well, thank you. And again, don't forget 18 there's Saturday's meeting and Monday night's. There's 19 handouts. As you walk out, there are handouts out there. 20 You can speak with the court reporter and make your 21 comments for the record. And otherwise, thank you very 22 much. We really appreciate you coming out tonight. Thank 23 you and drive safely. 24 (Brief recess.) 25 MS. WELDON: My name is Judith Weldon, W-e-l-d-o-n.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">76</p>

<p>1 I live at 1901 Fanwood, F-a-n-w-o-o-d, in the Los Altos 2 area. I arrived late at the meeting, but I didn't hear 3 anybody say that they addressed the safety issue in the 4 EIR. 5 Long Beach Airport is in the top 5 percent of 6 major inclusions on the airport. I know they have a new 7 instrument that they're putting into effect to prevent 8 this. 9 But I also want to bring up the fact that the 10 recent Jet Blue flight that came in about a month or so, 11 again, that had to come in with a nose wheel was bent. 12 We had our band radio on, which we could hear 13 the pilot talking to the communication tower. He was 14 given the choice of what airport he wanted to fly into, 15 whether it be Long Beach, Ontario, Palmdale or Los Angeles 16 or LAX. He picked LAX. 17 He said he would not fly into Long Beach 18 because it was surrounded by residential. He did not want 19 to fly into Ontario or Palmdale because of the heat and 20 the wind, which he thought would cause an additional 21 turbulence to the landing. So he wanted to fly into LAX. 22 We also think the reason why he didn't want to 23 fly into Long Beach was because that would tie up the one 24 major runway at Long Beach airport, which would mean that 25 all the rest of the Jet Blue flights would have to be</p> <p style="text-align: right;">77</p>	<p>1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)) ss. 2 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES) 3 4 I, MARY E. PIERCE, CSR 6143 and Deposition Officer 5 for the State of California, certify: 6 That I attended the foregoing hearing and that all 7 argument and comments made at the time of the proceedings 8 were recorded stenographically by me and that the 9 foregoing is a true record of the proceedings and all 10 comments made at the time thereof. 11 I hereby certify that I am not interested in the 12 event of the action. 13 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have subscribed my name this 14 27th day of December, 2005. 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of California</p> <p style="text-align: right;">79</p>
<p>1 detoured elsewhere. And I'm wondering if this shouldn't 2 be taken into consideration or the people at least know 3 about it. 4 (Whereupon the comments session was 5 concluded at 8:07 p.m.) 6 o-o-o 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25</p> <p style="text-align: right;">78</p>	